

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated October 27, 2004, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-9, 14, 16-19, 21, 23, 28-32, 34, 36-39, 41, 43-46, 48 and 50-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,909,023 (Ono). Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are patentable over Ono.

Regarding claim 1, Ono does not teach, disclose, or suggest a method including selecting an application service for a user or providing a voice activated interface. Ono discusses an online shopping support method and system capable of supplying proper services matching user specific needs and conditions (Abstract). A user's purchase frequency, purchase dates, and purchase amounts can be calculated for use in determining which products(s) or good(s) to display to the user for online shopping (col 4 ln 18 - col 5 ln 67 cited by the Examiner). Ono thus discusses an online interface for a single service, online shopping. Claim 1, however, recites a method including providing a user a voice activated interface to a voice application to invoke any of a plurality of application services and selecting an application service from the plurality of services for the user as a function of information representative of the user's past access to the application. Ono discusses a single service, online shopping, and does not teach, disclose or suggest providing a voice activated interface to a voice application or selecting an application service from a plurality of services as recited in claim 1. For at least these reasons, applicants respectfully assert that claim 1, and claims 2-4, 6, 8-9, and 14, that each depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, are patentable over Ono.

Regarding independent claim 16, Ono does not teach, disclose, or suggest the recited providing means or selecting means. Claim 16 recites an apparatus for providing a user with a voice activated interface to access a voice application to invoke any of a plurality of application services, and means for selecting an application service from the plurality of services as a function of information representative of the user's past access to the application. Ono does not teach, disclose, or suggest either of such means because Ono discusses a single service, online

shopping. For at least these reasons, applicants respectfully assert that claim 16, and claims 17-19, 21, 23, and 28, that each depend from claim 16, are patentable over Ono.

Regarding independent claim 29, Ono does not teach, disclose, or suggest selecting an application service for a user or providing a voice activated interface. Claim 29 recites a method for providing a user a voice activated interface to access a voice application to invoke any of a plurality of application services, and selecting an application service from the plurality of services based upon the pattern of usage. Ono discusses a single service, online shopping, and does not teach, disclose or suggest providing a voice activated interface to a voice application or selecting an application service from a plurality of services as recited in claim 29. For at least these reasons, applicants respectfully assert that claim 29, and claims 30-32, and 34, that each depend directly or indirectly from claim 29, are patentable over Ono.

Regarding independent claim 36, Ono does not teach, disclose, or suggest an apparatus to select an application service for a user or to provide a voice activated interface. Claim 36 recites an apparatus to provide a user with a voice activated interface to access a voice application to invoke any of a plurality of application services to analyze the information about the one or more application services invoked by the user to determine a pattern of usage of the one or more of the application services, and to select for the user an application service from the plurality of services based upon the pattern of usage. Ono discusses a single service, online shopping, and does not teach, disclose or suggest an apparatus to provide a voice activated interface to a voice application or to select an application service from a plurality of services as recited in claim 36. For at least these reasons, applicants respectfully assert that claim 36, and claims 37-39, and 41, that each depend directly or indirectly from claim 36, are patentable over Ono.

Regarding independent claim 43, Ono does not teach, disclose, or suggest an article of manufacture configured to cause a computer system to provide a voice activated interface to access a voice application to invoke any of a plurality of application services, or to select an application service based on a user's pattern of usage. Claim 43 recites an article of manufacture configured to cause a computer system to provide a voice activated interface to access a voice application to invoke any of a plurality of application services, and to select an application service from the plurality of services for the user based upon the pattern of usage. Ono discusses a single service, online shopping, and does not teach, disclose or suggest an article of manufacture to provide a voice activated interface to a voice application or to select an

application service from a plurality of services as recited in claim 43. For at least these reasons, applicants respectfully assert that claim 43, and claims 44-46, and 48, that each depend from claim 43, are patentable over Ono.

Claims 50-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,266,649 (Linden). Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are patentable over Linden.

Regarding independent claim 50, Linden does not teach, disclose, or suggest at least the recited providing of a voice activated interface or selecting of an application service. Linden discusses recommending items for purchase to an online user based on a set of items that are known to be of interest to the user, such as a set of items previously purchased by the user (col 5 ln 57 - col 6 ln 13 cited by the Examiner). Claim 50, however, recites a method including providing a user a voice activated interface to a voice application to invoke any of a plurality of application services and selecting an application service for the user as a function of information representative of other users' past access to the application. Linden does not teach, disclose or suggest providing a voice interface or selecting an application service because Linden discusses a single service, online shopping. For at least these reasons, applicants respectfully assert that claim 50, and claims 51-53 that each depend from claim 1, are patentable over Linden.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claim 54 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as obvious over Linden in view of Ono. Applicants respectfully assert that this claim is patentable over Ono and Linden. The Examiner does not assert that Ono makes up for the deficiencies of Linden noted above with respect to claim 50. Thus, claim 54 that depends on claim 50 is patentable over Linden in view of Ono for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 50.

Claims 5 and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as obvious over Ono in view of US Patent No. 6,298,330 (Gardenswartz). Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are patentable over Ono and Gardenswartz. The Examiner does not assert that Gardenswartz makes up for the deficiencies of Ono noted above with respect to claims 1 and 16. Thus, claims 5 and 20, that depend from claims 1 and 16 respectively, are patentable over Ono in view of Gardenswartz for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 7 and 22 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as obvious over Ono in view of US Patent No. 6,298,329 (Walker). Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are patentable over Ono and Walker. The Examiner does not assert that Walker makes up for the deficiencies of Ono noted above with respect to claims 1 and 16. Thus, claims 7 and 22, that depend indirectly from claims 1 and 16 respectively, are patentable over Ono in view of Walker for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 16.

Claims 10-12 and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as obvious over Ono in view of US Patent No. 5,646,986 (Sahni). Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are patentable over Ono and Sahni. First, applicants respectfully assert that Sahni is not in the same field of endeavor as Ono. Ono discusses an online shopping support method and system capable of supplying proper services matching user specific needs and conditions. Sahni discusses trunk allocation in a communication system based on a history of network use. Applicants respectfully assert that allocating trunks is not in the same field of endeavor as online shopping. Therefore, there is no motivation to combine Sahni and Ono. Second, even if Ono and Sahni were combined as suggested in the Office Action, the Examiner does not assert that Sahni makes up for the deficiencies of Ono noted above with respect to claims 1 and 16. Thus, claims 10-12 and claims 24-26 that directly and indirectly depend from claims 1 and 16 respectively, are patentable over Ono in view of Sahni for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 16.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as obvious over Ono in view of US Patent No. 6,584,447 (Fox). Applicants respectfully assert that this claim is patentable over Ono and Fox. First, applicants respectfully assert that Fox is not in the same field of endeavor as Ono. Ono discusses an online shopping support method and system capable of supplying proper services matching user specific needs and conditions. Fox discusses a method to analyze a sales forecast using weather and sales history. Applicants respectfully assert that a method to analyze a sales forecast using weather and sales history is not in the same field of endeavor as online shopping. Therefore, there is no motivation to combine Fox and Ono. Second, even if Ono and Fox were combined as suggested in the Office Action, the Examiner does not assert that Fox makes up for the deficiencies of Ono noted above with respect to claim 1. Thus, claim 13, that indirectly depends from claim 1, is patentable over Ono in view of Fox for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as obvious over Ono in view of Sahni, as applied to claim 24, and further in view of Fox. Applicants respectfully assert that this claim is patentable over Ono and Sahni and Fox because, as discussed above, neither Sahni nor Fox is in the same field of endeavor as Ono, and neither make up for the deficiencies of Ono with respect to claim 16.

Claims 35, 42, and 49 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as obvious over Ono in view of US Patent No. 6,330,543 (Kepecs). Applicants respectfully assert that this claim is patentable over Ono and Kepecs because even if Ono and Kepecs were combined as suggested in the Office Action, the Examiner does not assert that Kepecs makes up for the deficiencies of Ono noted above with respect to claims 29, 36 and 43. Thus, claims 35, 42 and 49, that depend on claims 29, 36 and 43 respectively, are patentable over Ono in view of Kepecs for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 29, 36 and 43.

Claims 15, 33, 40, and 47 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as obvious over Ono in view of US Patent No. 6,377,927 (Loghmani). Applicants respectfully assert that this claim is patentable over Ono and Loghmani because Loghmani teaches away from the application.

Loghmani discusses a voice-optimized database and a method of using audio vector valuation to search a voice-optimized database and to enhance existing, non-voice-enabled databases to perform searches from spoken queries (col. 1 ln 13-16). In contrast, claim 15 recites providing an application service based on both an accuracy of the speech recognition and the number of times the user previously selected the application service. Claims 33, 40, and 47 recite providing an application service based on both the accuracy of the speech recognition and the frequency with which the user invoked a particular application. Thus, Loghmani discusses a technique for improving speech recognition while claims 15, 33, 40, and 47 recite techniques to select an application service based upon both speech recognition accuracy and either the number of times that the application service is invoked (claim 15) or the frequency with which an application service is invoked (claims 33, 40, 47). For at least these reasons, claims 15, 33, 40, and 47 are patentable over Loghmani.

Based on the foregoing, this application is believed to be in an allowable condition, and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to call the Applicant's Attorney at the number provided below with any questions.

Respectfully submitted,



Shane H. Hunter, Esq. (Reg. No. 41,858)
Attorney for Applicants
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris,
Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.
Telephone 617/348-1765
Customer Number 30623

Date: January 24, 2005

TRA 1998365v1